APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/658,205	09/10/2003	Moon-Heui Lee	44630	3240

7590 06/04/2007

Peter L. Kendall
Roylance, Abrams, Berdo & Goodman, L.L.P.
Suite 600
1300 19th Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20036

EXAMINER
PHUONG, DAI

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2617	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
06/04/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE _3_ MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS,
WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed
  after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED. (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any
  earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _27 March 2007_.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is
closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) _11-13,17-19,30-32 and 36-55_ is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☒ Claim(s) _11-13,17-19, 30-32 and 36-38_ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) _39-55_ is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on _10 September 2003_ is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☒ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage
application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1.   Applicant's arguments filed 03/27/2006 have been fully considered but they are not

persuasive. Applicant had been selected group III on 04/26/2006 which includes claims 11-13,

17-19, 30-32 and 36-52.   Claims 53-55 have been added in response filed on 03/27/2007.

Claims 11-13, 17-19, 30-32 and 36-55 are currently pending.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in
> section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are
> such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person
> having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the
> manner in which the invention was made.

3.   Claims 39, 42, 44-46, 49 and 51-52 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Kamimura (Pub. No: 20020094806) in view of in view of Sun (U.S.

6219410).

Regarding claim 39, Kamimura discloses a method of automatically deleting logged calls

and messages in a mobile phone, in order to maintain security and protect privacy, the method

comprising the steps of: inputting a phone number into a log deleting database of a telephone

directory ([0039] to [0043] and [0045] to [0052]); storing the input phone number in the log

deleting database ([0039] to [0043] and [0045] to [0052]); determining whether the input phone

number is detected in an incoming or outgoing phone call ([0041] to [0043]).   However,

Kamimura does not disclose preventing the input phone number from being displayed for the incoming or outgoing phone call.

In the same field of endeavor, Sun discloses preventing the input phone number from being displayed for the incoming or outgoing phone call (fig. 3, col. 5, lines 2-20).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the radio communication apparatus of Kamimura by specifically including preventing the input phone number from being displayed for the incoming or outgoing phone call, as taught by Sun, the motivation being in order to hide the number inputted from being display on a display such as telephone number as secret or privacy.

Regarding claim 42, the combination of Kamimura and Sun disclose all the limitations in claim 39. Further, Kamimura discloses the method further comprising: receiving voice mail associated with the input number in a private voice mailbox, the private voice mailbox being separate from the general mailbox ([0045] to [0052]).

Regarding claim 44, the combination of Kamimura and Sun disclose all the limitations in claim 39. Further, Kamimura discloses the method further comprising: associating at least one of a picture icon and distinctive ring with the input number detected in the incoming phone call ([0039] to [0041] and [0045] to [0052]).

Regarding claim 45, the combination of Kamimura and Sun disclose all the limitations in claim 39. Further, Kamimura discloses the method wherein the phone number is input using a keypad or a phonebook ([0039] to [0041] and [0045] to [0052]).

Regarding claim 46, this claim is rejected for the same reason as set forth in claim 39.

Regarding claim 49, this claim is rejected for the same reason as set forth in claim 42.

Regarding claim 51, this claim is rejected for the same reason as set forth in claim 44.

Regarding claim 52, this claim is rejected for the same reason as set forth in claim 45.

4.   Claims 40-41, 43, 47-48 and 50 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kamimura (Pub. No: 20020094806) in view of Sun (U.S. 6219410) and further in view of Kumagai (Pub. No: 20020029246).

Regarding claim 40, the combination of Kamimura and Sun disclose all the limitations in claim 1. However, Kamimura does not disclose the method further comprising: selectively deleting the input phone number from a general call log or received number list if the input phone number is detected in the incoming or outgoing phone call.

In the same field of endeavor, Kumagai discloses the method further comprising: selectively deleting the input phone number from a general call log or received number list if the input phone number is detected in the incoming or outgoing phone call ([0072] to [0084]).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the communication device of the combination of Kamimura and Sun by specifically including the method further comprising: selectively deleting the input phone number from a general call log or received number list if the input phone number is detected in the incoming or outgoing phone call, as taught by Kumagai, the motivation being in order to protect private information in the file access history.

Regarding claim 41, the combination of Kamimura and Sun and Kumagai disclose all the limitations in claim 40. Further, Kamimura discloses the method further comprising: displaying

a "no caller information" in the general call log or received number list if the input phone number

is detected in the incoming or outgoing phone call (fig. 4, [0045] to [0061]).

Regarding claim 43, this claim is rejected for the same reason as set forth in claim 41.

Regarding claim 47, this claim is rejected for the same reason as set forth in claim 40.

Regarding claim 48, this claim is rejected for the same reason as set forth in claim 41.

Regarding claim 50, this claim is rejected for the same reason as set forth in claim 43.

5.   Claims 53-55 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Haimi-

Cohen (U.S. 5983093) in view of Sun (U.S. 6219410).

Regarding claim 53, Haimi-Cohen disclose a method of automatically deleting logged

calls and messages in a mobile phone, in order to maintain security and protect privacy, the

method comprising the steps of:

inputting a phone number into a log deleting database of a telephone directory, allowing

only an authorized user to input the phone number (fig. 2, col. 6, lines 5-43 and col. 7, lines 9-

39);

storing the input phone number and a method of dialing and recording the phone number

in the log deleting database, if the inputted phone number is not present in the log deleting

management database (fig. 2, col. 6, lines 5-43 and col. 7, lines 9-39);

determining whether the input phone number is detected in an incoming or outgoing

phone call (fig. 2, col. 6, lines 5-43 and col. 7, lines 9-39). However, Haimi-Cohen does not

disclose preventing the input phone number from being displayed for the incoming or outgoing

phone call and from being recorded in the general call and/or message log.

In the same field of endeavor, Sun discloses preventing the input phone number from being displayed for the incoming or outgoing phone call and from being recorded in the general call and/or message log (fig. 3, col. 5, lines 2-20. It should be noted that once Sun discloses preventing the input phone number from being displayed for the incoming or outgoing phone call. Therefore, there is nothing to prevent Sun to prevent to display others).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the radio communication apparatus of Kamimura by specifically including preventing the input phone number from being displayed for the incoming or outgoing phone call and from being recorded in the general call and/or message log, as taught by Sun, the motivation being in order to hide the number inputted from being display on a display such as telephone number as secret or privacy.

Regarding claim 54, this claim is rejected for the same reason as set forth in claim 53.

Regarding claim 55, this claim is rejected for the same reason as set forth in claim 42.

Reasons for Allowance

6.   The following is an examiner's statement of reasons for allowed:

Independent claims 11, 17, 30 and 36 are allowed.

Claims 12-13 are dependent on claim 11.

Claims 18-19 are dependent on claim 17.

Claims 31-32 are dependent on claim 30.

Claims 37-38 are dependent on claim 36.

Regarding claim 11, the prior art record fails anticipate or render obvious a method of automatically deleting logged calls and messages in a mobile phone, in order to maintain security

and protect privacy, which comprises the steps of: inputting a telephone number; pressing a "send" key on the mobile phone; determining whether said input telephone number is present in a phonebook of the mobile phone; displaying said input telephone number on a display section of said mobile phone; *detecting telephone numbers stored in a log deleting management database; determining whether said input telephone number is included in the telephone numbers stored in the log deleting management database; recording said input telephone number, if said input telephone number is not present in the log deleting management database, in a recently dialed number list; performing a dialing function; searching for a method of dialing said number, if said input telephone number is present in the log deleting management database; and performing a dialing function while concealing said input telephone number and a caller's name, if the method of dialing said number is caller concealment,* all limitations combination as defined by applicant.

Regarding claim 17, the prior art record fails anticipate or render obvious method of automatically deleting logged calls and messages in a mobile phone, in order to maintain security and protect privacy, which comprises the steps of: inputting a message and a telephone number and sending said input message and telephone number; reading telephone numbers stored in a log deleting management database; *determining whether said sent telephone number is included in the telephone numbers stored in the log deleting management database; recording said sent message and said sent telephone number in a sent message list; performing a message sending function if said sent telephone number is not present in the log deleting management database; determining whether said sent message and said telephone number should be recorded in a secret sent message list if said sent telephone number is present in the*

log deleting management database; recording said sent message and said sent telephone

number in the secret sent message list, if said sent telephone number is present in the log

deleting management database; and performing a message sending function for said sent

message and sent telephone number, all limitations combination as defined by applicant.

Regarding claim 30, the prior art record fails anticipate or render obvious a system for automatically deleting logged calls and messages in a mobile phone, in order to maintain security and protect privacy, the system comprising: an input, adapted to input a telephone number and activate a "send" key on the mobile phone; and a controller, adapted to perform the following operations: determine whether said input telephone number is present in a phonebook of the mobile phone; display said input telephone number on a display section of said mobile phone; *detect telephone numbers stored in a log deleting management database; determine whether said input telephone number is included in the telephone numbers stored in the log deleting management database; record said input telephone number, if said input telephone number is not present in the log deleting management database, in a recently dialed number list; perform a dialing function; search for a method of dialing said number, if said input telephone number is present in the log deleting management database; and perform a dialing function while concealing said input telephone number and a caller's name, if the method of dialing said number is caller concealment*, all limitations combination as defined by applicant.

Regarding claim 36, the prior art record fails anticipate or render obvious a system for automatically deleting logged calls and messages in a mobile phone, in order to maintain security and protect privacy, the system comprising: a first mobile telephone and a second mobile phone; and said first mobile phone being adapted to perform the following operations: input a message

and a telephone number; send said input message and telephone number to said second mobile phone; read telephone numbers stored in a log deleting management database; *determine whether said sent telephone number is included in the telephone numbers stored in the log deleting management database; record said sent message and said sent telephone number in a sent message list; perform a message sending function if said sent telephone number is not present in the log deleting management database; determine whether said sent message and said telephone number should be recorded in a secret sent message list if said sent telephone number is present in the log deleting management database; record said sent message and said sent telephone number in the secret sent message list, if said sent telephone number is present in the log deleting management database; and perform a message sending function for said sent message and sent telephone number,* all limitations combination as defined by applicant.

Response to Argument

7.   Applicant, on page 17 of his response, argues that Kamimura does not teach or suggest the Applicants' claimed method and system that seeks to automatically delete logged calls and messages in a mobile phone, in order to maintain security and protect privacy, as well as to prevent a number in a log deleting database from being displayed when detected in an incoming or outgoing phone call. However, the Examiner respectfully disagrees.

First, in response to applicant's arguments, the recitation " automatically delete logged calls and messages in a mobile phone, in order to maintain security and protect privacy" has not been given patentable weight because the recitation occurs in the preamble. A preamble is generally not accorded any patentable weight where it merely recites the purpose of a process or

the intended use of a structure, and where the body of the claim does not depend on the preamble

for completeness but, instead, the process steps or structural limitations are able to stand alone.

See *In re Hirao*, 535 F.2d 67, 190 USPQ 15 (CCPA 1976) and *Kropa v. Robie*, 187 F.2d 150,

152, 88 USPQ 478, 481 (CCPA 1951).

Second, the Applicant argues that Kamimura does not teach to prevent a number in a log

deleting database from being displayed when detected in an incoming or outgoing phone call. In

response to applicant's arguments against the references individually, one cannot show

nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on

combinations of references. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re*

Merck & Co., 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986).

8.   Applicant, on page 17 of his response, argues that Kamimura in view of Sun does not

teach the features of the Applicants' method and system comprising automatically deleting

logged calls and messages in a mobile phone, in order to maintain security and protect privacy,

comprising inputting a phone number into a log deleting database of a telephone directory,

storing the input phone number in the log deleting database, determining whether the input

phone number is detected in an incoming or outgoing phone call and thereafter, preventing the

input phone number from being displayed for the incoming or outgoing phone call. However,

the Examiner respectfully disagrees.

In response to applicant's arguments against the references individually, one cannot show

nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on

combinations of references. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re*

Merck & Co., 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986).

9.   Applicant, on page 18 of his response, argues that Kamimura does not disclose or suggest

receiving voice mail associated with the input number in a private voice mailbox, the private

voice mailbox being separate from the general mailbox. However, the Examiner respectfully

disagrees.

First, in response, during patent examination, the pending claims must be "given their

broadest reasonable interpretation consistent with the specification." In re Hyatt, 211 F.3d 1367,

1372, 54 USPQ2d 1664, 1667 (Fed. Cir. 2000). Applicant always has the opportunity to amend

the claims during prosecution, and broad interpretation by the examiner reduces the possibility

that the claim, once issued, will be interpreted more broadly than is justified. In re Prater, 415

F.2d 1393, 1404-05, 162 USPQ 541, 550- 51 (CCPA 1969). The broadest reasonable

interpretation of the claims must also be consistent with the interpretation that those skilled in the

art would reach. In re Cortright, 165 F.3d 1353, 1359, 49 USPQ2d 1464, 1468 (Fed. Cir. 1999).

See MPEP 2111.

Second, Kamimura discloses that the incoming call can be an incoming voice call or _**an**_

**incoming message call** (receiving voice mail) and the vibrator 53 generates a vibration with the

set pattern when the apparatus receives an incoming voice _**or message call**_.

Conclusion

10.   **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** · Applicant is reminded of the extension of time
policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE
MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO
MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after
the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period
will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37
CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event,

however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

11.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Dai A Phuong whose telephone number is 571-272-7896. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday, 9:00 A.M. to 5:00 P.M..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nguyen M Duc can be reached on 571-272-7503. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-7503.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Dai Phuong
AU: 2617
Date: 05/22/2007

DUC M. NGUYEN
SUPERVISORY PRIMARY EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600